

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated October 16, 2007. The present application was unintentionally abandoned for failing to respond to the Office Action because until recently, Applicant was unaware of the Office Action and unaware that the application had become abandoned. I have made a reasonable inquiry, and the entire delay in responding to the Office Action was unintentional. A petition to revive the application is being submitted with this response.

The above amendment amends the specification to update references to related patent applications and to correct errors and improve clarity of the present application. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-20 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. Claims 1-17 stand rejected. Claims 18-20 were objected to.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,967,977 (Hasson). Claims 8, 16, and 17 are canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-15.

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Hasson at least by reciting, “at least one semiconductor laser configured to generate subnanosecond optical pulses; a trigger system coupled to the semiconductor laser so that the semiconductor laser generates an optical pulse in response to an optical pulse received by the trigger system; [and] a regeneration waveguide coupled to directed optical pulses from the laser to the trigger system.” Hasson fails to teach or suggest a regeneration waveguide connected between a laser and a trigger system. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Hasson.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Hasson for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Hasson.

Independent claim 9 distinguishes over Hasson at least by reciting, “providing at least one semiconductor laser configured to issue subnanosecond optical pulses; directing a portion of each pulse from the semiconductor laser through regeneration waveguide; triggering the semiconductor laser to generate a new pulse when a prior pulse from the laser has traversed the regeneration waveguide, wherein triggering repeated generation of pulse creates a periodic

pulse train having a first frequency.” Hasson fails to teach or suggest using portions of prior pulses from a laser to trigger generation of new pulses from the laser so that a pulse train is generated. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentable over Hasson.

Claims 10-15 depend from claim 9 and are patentable over Hasson for at least the same reasons that claim 9 is patentable over Hasson.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 18-20 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected claim but were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 18 is amended to independent form and is being further amended to alter the original limitations of claim 17. However, Applicant submits that claim 18 as amended is patentable. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18 and no longer depend from a rejected claim. In view of the above amendment, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 18-20.

New claim 21 depends from claim 18 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 18 is patentable.

In summary, claims 1-20 were pending in the application. This response amends claims 1-7, 9-15, and 18-20, cancels claims 8, 16, and 17, and adds claim 21. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application including claims 1-7, 9-15, and 18-21.

Respectfully submitted,

/David Millers 37396/

David Millers
Reg. No. 37,396